

and they need to change the deadline from the end of this year, 12/31, to a time in 2021.

We cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

We call on Speaker PELOSI to call targeted, focused relief to the House floor today.

REMEMBERING MARINE CORPORAL RONALD R. PAYNE, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPANO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the legacy of Marine Corporal Ronald R. Payne, Jr., a local hero who proudly served our country in the U.S. Marine Corps and was killed in combat on May 7, 2004.

Payne graduated from Mulberry High School as a star football and basketball player.

As a marine, Payne had been part of the initial force that invaded Iraq and entered Baghdad. He then volunteered to return for a second overseas tour. He was initially sent to Afghanistan to help with elections but was then sent into combat.

Corporal Payne will be remembered as the first marine killed serving in Afghanistan.

He will also be remembered as a man of faith. A late journal entry reads, "The fear is starting to turn into excitement. Besides, what do I have to be afraid of really? I have God on my side, and He said He will never leave us nor forsake us. Having Him is better than any type of support or weapon that man can give."

To his family, our district still mourns Ron's loss. I salute you for raising such a hero who was also such a servant.

REMEMBERING STAFF SERGEANT JOHN ALLEN REINERS

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Staff Sergeant John Allen Reinners, a local hero from Florida's 15th District who served our country in the Armed Forces and who was sadly killed in combat in the Afghanistan theater.

After participating in Junior ROTC for 4 years and graduating from Haines City High School, he enlisted in the U.S. Army and then began with the Army Rangers.

He served at Fort Drum, New York, and Fort Carson, Colorado, and, during this time, also did two tours in Iraq, where he received his first Purple Heart.

In 2001, Staff Sergeant Reinners died of wounds sustained when enemy forces attacked his unit with an improvised explosive device in Afghanistan's Zhari Province.

He was awarded his second Purple Heart and the Bronze Star Medal posthumously for his valiant service and dedication to his team.

At home, Reinners was also a devoted husband to Casey and father to Lex.

To the entire Reinners family, our district and community still mourn

John's loss. He was truly the epitome of a great American soldier, and his sacrifices will not be forgotten.

REMEMBERING SPECIALIST RYAN MICHAEL LUMLEY

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service and legacy of Specialist Ryan Lumley, a devoted husband and son who served this country in the Armed Forces and was killed in combat in Wardak Province, Afghanistan, on December 3, 2011.

Ryan graduated from Cedar Key High School in 2008, joined the U.S. Army in 2009, and soon thereafter reported to Fort Bliss in El Paso, Texas, where he excelled with the 2nd Battalion, 5th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team.

Unfortunately, at the young age of 21, Ryan lost his life to an improvised explosive device.

Due to his outstanding service and dedication to our country, Ryan was awarded the National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and several other badges and ribbons.

Ryan is survived by his wife, Kimber, a loving family, and many hometown friends who remember him fondly for his strong character and patriotism.

While some time has passed since his departure, may his legacy continue to uplift his loved ones and encourage a grateful Nation.

REMEMBERING SERGEANT DANIEL MCKINNON ANGUS

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Sergeant Daniel McKinnon Angus, a local hero of Florida's 15th District who was killed in action in Afghanistan on January 24, 2010.

Daniel graduated from Armwood High School in 2000 and, in 2003, joined the U.S. Marine Corps, where he knew he belonged and hoped to make a career of serving his community and his country.

Daniel stood out among his peers and received a Combat Action Ribbon, two Good Conduct Medals, the Afghanistan and Iraq Campaign Medals, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and a number of service decorations.

He loved spending time with his wife, Bonnie, and his 1-year-old daughter, now 11 years old. May she always know and treasure the knowledge of her father's heroism.

You see, men and women like Daniel, who are willing to lay down their lives in defense of our country and in support of others many miles away, are what makes our Nation the greatest on Earth.

Let us never take their sacrifice or that of their surviving families in vain.

DEFENDING MOTION TO RECOMMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to sound the alarm that House Demo-

crats are considering a rule change that would severely limit the rights of the minority party in the House for years to come.

I am referring to the partisan push to water down or to eliminate the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the MTR, as it is called, is a critical procedural tool that gives the minority party one last opportunity to improve legislation before a final vote on this House floor. An MTR not only increases transparency between Members of Congress and their constituents, but it holds Members accountable and forces them to go on record for viewpoints that they hold.

Weakening the MTR would only serve to shield Members from criticism, suffocate debate on key policy issues, and overturn longstanding House precedent. It would be a blatant power grab by the majority Democrat Party.

That is why my colleagues and I will be appealing to the Rules Committee this week in writing, demanding that the MTR be preserved.

CONFRONTING VOTER FRAUD

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 weeks, I have heard from an overwhelming number of my constituents, and they do not have confidence in the integrity of November's election.

They are outraged that media pundits and establishment Democrat politicians are sneering at the very concept of taking the time to ensure that every legal vote is counted and that every illegal vote is thrown out.

Every citizen has a right to seek justice in a court of law, and that includes the President of the United States. His legal team needs to be given the time to collect and present evidence of voting and tabulation irregularities.

Until the courts have played their constitutional role, we should be wary of declaring winners and losers.

Look, if we could spend 2 years investigating conspiracy theories about Russian collusion, we should be able to take a few weeks to confirm the integrity of this election.

I am glad that Attorney General Bill Barr authorized the Department of Justice to investigate any and all allegations of illegal activity. He took this necessary step after 38 of my House colleagues and I requested that the Department leave no stone unturned in this effort.

We will also be introducing legislation this very week that will require the DOJ to create a national strategy to identify and combat voter intimidation, fraud, ballot system glitches, sabotage, and hacking.

Mr. Speaker, voting is the most sacred civic duty in our Nation. In an election for our Nation's highest office, involving unprecedented levels of mail-in voting, we must take the time to ensure that every legal vote is counted and every illegal vote is not counted.

Nothing is more important than the integrity of our ballots.

□ 1030

ANOTHER ABDICATION OF DUTIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it has become quite apparent over the past few months that House Democrats just don't want to show up for work. They rallied behind proxy voting the moment the idea was conjured up, and ever since, they have become complacent in their duties.

The American people are showing up to work because their livelihoods depend on it. But when it comes to Democrat Members of Congress, it is the exact opposite. What a stark contrast.

For months, my Republican colleagues and I have made the trip from our districts to Washington to conduct the business of the people's House in the open. We have been present at committee hearings, votes, and other important functions, but it certainly seems that our Democrat colleagues don't share that same level of commitment.

What does that tell you about them?

Mr. Speaker, we can't ignore the fact that we are in the middle of a global pandemic, but that does not mean that we get to abdicate our duties as Members of Congress. Members of the United States Senate have shown up to conduct their business.

So why isn't the House doing the same?

What is concerning most of all is that the initial endeavor to implement proxy voting has now evolved into something more asinine: vote by text.

This attempt to consolidate power by Speaker PELOSI is just another feeble move, and one that runs counter to the operation of this deliberative body that has stood for hundreds of years, yet House Democrats seem perfectly content with this idea.

The American notion of showing up to work and fulfilling your duties seems to be a foreign concept to them. If they spent their time working, and less time looking for ways to get out of work, we would be making progress.

This is not an effective way to legislate and, in the end, the American people are the ones who will bear the brunt of this imprudent course of action.

The people's House must return to regular order, and if we keep kicking the can down the road on conducting business in the open, this institution will become rife with complacency. It is time we get back to work. Stop the delays. Stop the political plays. The American people are counting on us.

CONGRESS ELECTS PRESIDENT IF NO ELECTORAL COLLEGE WINNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this is the second in the series of

House floor speeches by me on the recent Presidential elections.

Previously, I covered constitutional and Federal statutory law mandating that Congress—not the Supreme Court—decides whether to accept or reject States' electoral college vote submissions.

Today's remarks focus on who decides a Presidential election if no candidate receives an electoral college majority vote because of a tie, because multiple candidates split the electoral college vote, or because Congress rejected State electoral college votes.

Per the United States Constitution's 12th Amendment, Congress—not the Supreme Court—elects the next President and Vice President of the United States if no candidate wins an electoral college vote majority. Congress' decision is final, determinative, and non-reviewable.

The 12th Amendment states that if no candidate has a majority of the electoral college vote, then, from the three highest vote-getters for President, "the House of Representatives shall choose immediately by ballot the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote . . . and a majority of all of the States shall be necessary to a choice."

As an aside, the 12th Amendment requires the Senate to elect the Vice President. There is a twist in the House vote for President. A majority of Congressmen does not elect the President. Rather, the House votes by State delegations to elect the next President of the United States.

America has 50 States. After the 2020 elections, 26 State delegations have a Republican majority. Twenty States have a Democrat majority. The remaining State delegations are tied 50/50, with Iowa undecided pending an uncalled election.

Hence, if Congress rejects electoral college votes from States with election processes that are so badly flawed as to be unreliable and unworthy of acceptance, House Republicans control the election of the next President of the United States.

Let me repeat that for emphasis. House Republicans control the election of the next President of the United States.

For emphasis, the 12th Amendment has, on occasion, resulted in Congress electing the next President of the United States.

For example, in 1824, Andrew Jackson led the electoral college with 99 votes, to 85 votes for John Quincy Adams, to 41 votes for William Crawford, to 37 votes for House Speaker Henry Clay. The House elected second place finisher John Quincy Adams President of the United States over first place finisher Andrew Jackson, prompting Andrew Jackson to famously declare, "The Judas of the West has closed the contract and will receive the 30 pieces of silver . . . Was

there ever witnessed such a bare faced corruption in any country before?"

Another example is the 1876 election, wherein Democrat Samuel Tilden won the popular vote and amassed 184 electoral college votes, one shy of Ohio Republican Rutherford B. Hayes' 185 electoral college votes.

Louisiana's, Florida's, and South Carolina's electoral college votes were disputed because it strained credibility to believe these States voted Republican while still suffering from the destructive effects of a Republican-led invasion during the Civil War. Congress appointed a 15-member commission to study the matter, which split on party lines: eight Republicans for Hayes, seven Democrats for Tilden.

Congress then elected Hayes President of the United States in a deal that gave Louisiana's, Florida's, and South Carolina's disputed electoral college votes to Hayes in exchange for removing occupying Union troops from the South and ending reconstruction.

In sum, the history and law are clear: Congress, not the Supreme Court, determines who wins or loses Presidential elections.

PENNSYLVANIA VOTERS CONCERNED ABOUT VOTING IRREGULARITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, many of the voters in Pennsylvania and in my district are rightfully upset and concerned about the irregular actions which occurred in the past election. There are valid reasons for the collective feeling of disenfranchisement and of distrust stemming from various election processes and procedural changes which were outside of statute.

Thousands—no—millions in Pennsylvania have a feeling of intense frustration and believe that their constitutional rights have been violated. To start, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court granted a 3-day extension for late-arriving ballots, usurping the authority of the State legislature and contradicting the U.S. Constitution, which clearly states: "The times, places, and manner of holding elections shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof."

These constitutional authorities are not fair-weather laws, despite the challenges posed by the pandemic. The highly irregular actions of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court resulted in the unlawful counting of over 10,000 ballots that arrived after the statutory required time of 8 p.m. on election day—nobody disputes this—mitigating an accurate ballot count and, at the same time, fueling great distrust in the process.

Second, there are serious disputes over how individual mail-in ballots with technical errors were handled across the Commonwealth. Pennsylvania State law dictates that mail-in